DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 447 159 TM 031 976

TITLE	Designing a Standards-Based Accountability System for Language Minority and Immigrant Student Populations: A Guide for School District Personnel and Program Evaluators. Second Edition.
INSTITUTION	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	1999-09-00
NOTE	34p.; A joint publication of the Language Policy and Leadership Office and the Language Proficiency and Academic Accountability Unit.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Standards; *Accountability; Elementary Secondary Education; Guides; *Immigrants; *Language Minorities; Limited English Speaking; *Student Evaluation; *Systems Development

ABSTRACT

This guide contains specific comments and insights concerning the application of a standards-based evaluation and accountability system in schools and school districts that enroll significant concentrations of language minority and immigrant students. The guide introduces key concepts associated with the development and maintenance of a standards-based evaluation and accountability system and suggests approaches for the inclusion of English learner (EL) and immigrant students in the system. Guidance is also provided on appropriate assessment approaches to be used with EL students and on determining the appropriate language of assessment of individual EL students. The guide also contains examples of how to collect data, how to develop supportive reports on EL and immigrant student performance, and how to draw conclusions about program effectiveness, including how to use evaluation data to advocate for program improvement. Appendixes contain suggested standardized assessment approaches, determining the language of assessment, collecting data, and reporting student performance. (Contains 14 tables.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 447 159

Designing a Standards-Based Accountability System for Language Minority and Immigrant Student Populations

A Guide for School District Personnel and Program Evaluators

Second Edition, September 1999
Revised

TM031976

California Department of Education
A Joint Publication of the
Language Policy and Leadership Office and the
Language Proficiency and Academic Accountability Unit

This publication contains non-binding guidance regarding selected issues associated with the inclusion of English Learners (ELs) and immigrant students in a program, school, or district standards-based evaluation and accountability system. For additional copies of this document or for information related to the contents of the guide, contact the Language Policy and Leadership Office at (916) 657-2566 or the Language Proficiency and Academic Accountability Unit at (916) 657-4674.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dedication

This publication is dedicated to the more than two million language minority and immigrant students enrolled in California's public schools.

> *"Do you mean that after you interview me, you may use my words in a report that the politicians will read? And after they read it, they might decide to make the schools better? That's amazing!"*
>
> — Cambodian immigrant student as quoted in ***Crossing the Schoolhouse Border*** (1988)

This publication is also dedicated to all those educators who struggle daily in the attempt to provide language minority and immigrant students with an equal educational opportunity.

> *"Of all the words of mice and men, the saddest is it might have been."*
>
> —John Greenleaf Whittier

Acknowledgements

The project lead and primary author of this publication is David Dolson, Consultant in the Language Policy and Leadership Office. Other staff at the California Department of Education who provided assistance in the development of this document are: Jan Mayer, Lauri Burnham, Hector Rico, Leroy Hamm, Tej Pandy, and Dale Carlson. We would also like to thank two former staff members, Fred Tempes and Suanna Gilman-Ponce. Administrative guidance for the project was provided by Norm Gold and Maria Trejo.

> *"Before I came to America I had dreams of life here. I thought about tall Anglos, big buildings, and houses with lawns. I was surprised when I arrived to see so many kinds of people -- Black people, Asians. I found people from Korea and Cambodia and Mexico. In California I found not just America, I found the world."*
>
> — Mexican immigrant student as quoted in ***Crossing the Schoolhouse Border*** (1988)

Designing A Standards-Based Accountability System for Language Minority and Immigrant Student Populations

School districts and individual school sites often are asked to provide evaluation and accountability data that indicate that specially funded students are learning the district's core curriculum. These data are also required as a condition of funding for several federally funded programs such as Title I, Title VII, and the Emergency Immigrant Education Program (EIEP) as well as by federal civil rights laws[1]. In addition state laws and regulations[2] require that a district must have results of an annual evaluation which demonstrate that each of its participating schools is implementing consolidated programs which are effective under criteria established by the local governing board. Furthermore, compliance issues (I-EL2a and b) in the *State Program for English Learners* (EL students, also referred to as students of limited-English proficiency, LEP) require that a district assemble individual and group data to show that EL students are acquiring English language proficiency and progressing in the district's core curriculum at a rate that will enable them to meet grade level academic standards within a reasonable period of time.

Directives from the U.S. Department of Education and the California Department of Education (CDE) plan regarding the *Improving America's School Act (IASA)* also require school districts to set standards, assess the progress of students, and disaggregate achievement data for groups of students participating in programs such as English learner, Immigrant, Refugee, Migrant, and Title I Education.

To meet these legal requirements for evaluation and accountability and to provide information to parents, local boards, regulatory agencies, and others, the CDE strongly recommends that districts establish a standards-based evaluation and accountability system consisting of at least the following components:

(1) Content and Performance Standards
(2) Assessment
(3) Data Collection
(4) Data Management
(5) Analyses and Reporting
(6) Use of Student and Program Information

Information regarding California's new Public School Accountability Act (PSAA) is available in several CDE communications filed at the CDE web site (http://www.cde.ca.gov). These communications provide general information regarding various aspects of the law. In contrast, this guide contains specific comments and insights concerning the application of a standards-based evaluation and accountability system in schools and school districts that enroll significant concentrations of language minority and immigrant students. This guide introduces key concepts associated with the development and maintenance of a standards-based evaluation and accountability system and suggests approaches for the inclusion of EL and immigrant students in the system. Guidance is also provided on appropriate assessment approaches to be used with EL students (Appendix - A) and on determining the appropriate language(s) of assessment of individual EL students (Appendix - B). The guide also includes examples of how to collect data

[1] 20 U.S.C. » 1703 (f). and Castañeda v. Pickard (5th Cir. 1981) 648 F.2d 989, 1010, 1014, 1015).
[2] PSAA, EC Section 52050-52058 and Section 3942(2) of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations.

(Appendix - C), how to develop supportive reports on EL and immigrant student performance (Appendix - D), and how to draw conclusions about program effectiveness, including how to use evaluation data to advocate for program improvement (Appendix - E).

"Everything should be made as simple as possible, but not simpler"
— Albert Einstein

I. CONTENT AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Adopting content and performance standards associated with grade-level performance and graduation requirements

A. The standards adopted for EL and former EL and immigrant students in the core subjects such as mathematics, science, social science, health and others courses should be the same standards as those required for mainstream students. Realistically, however, interim benchmarks should be set for EL and immigrant students to allow for some reasonable period of time before these students are expected to meet grade level norms.

B. As part of the core curriculum, all EL students must receive English Language Development (ELD) until they are redesignated as fluent in English (FEP). During the time that EL students are enrolled in ELD, their performance should be measured according to the English language development (ELD) standards adopted by the State Board of Education or other standards of equal or greater rigor.

In contrast to English language arts, where standards are developed for each grade level, ELD standards are based on the number of years of instruction and/or contextualized by English language proficiency levels such as beginning, early intermediate, intermediate, early advanced, advanced, and also by grade spans (K-2, 3-6, 7-8, 9-12).

C. In programs where EL students are enrolled in a course of study that includes primary language arts instruction, the primary language arts standards should be comparable to the mainstream English language arts standards. The primary language arts curriculum and standards should be articulated with both the ELD and mainstream English language arts curricula and standards.

"The beginning is often the most important part of the work."
—Plato

II. ASSESSMENT

Establishing assessment procedures to determine the progress of individual EL and immigrant students and groups of EL and immigrant students

A. Districts are required to assess <u>all</u> students with the state designated standardized test pursuant to the Standardized Testing and Reporting Program (STAR), the Stanford-9 (SAT 9). Spanish-speaking EL students who have been in school for twelve or fewer months must also be assessed with the SABE[2]. EL students from other language groups who have been in school for twelve or fewer months must also take a primary language standardized achievement test, if available.

B. In cases where a mandated test, such as the SAT 9 is not a valid and reliable measure for use with EL and immigrant students, that is, the measure has not been normed on populations of EL and immigrant students, districts should take steps to disaggregate scores for EL and immigrant students based on the amount of time these students are enrolled in school. Over time, as EL and immigrant students approach fluency in English and gain mainstream cultural competence, the validity and reliability of such measures generally improves. (See Appendix D for examples and further explanation).

C. In addition to the state mandated assessments, districts are encouraged to use multiple measures for each subject area of the core curriculum including ELD[3]. As much as possible, the district should utilize assessment approaches that provide the most accurate, valid, and reliable data on the academic standing of individual EL and immigrant students and groups of EL and immigrant students (See Appendix A).

In the case of EL and immigrant students, additional types of measures that might be used include:

1. Criterion-referenced tests
2. Grade point average (GPA)
3. Teacher observation measures/checklists using rubrics or other scoring schemes
4. Ratings of work in student portfolios
5. Grade-level promotional and graduation rates including redesignation rates
6. Rates of referrals to special programs and services
7. Rates of attendance, participation, completion, and suspension
8. Rates of dropouts, college enrollments, etc.
9. Other standardized tests.

D. Whenever possible, assessments of subject matter areas such as mathematics, science, social science, health and other courses required for grade-level promotion should be administered to EL students in the language in which they are best able to demonstrate their knowledge of the subject matter. When assessments in the primary language are not

[3] A state mandated assessment for ELD is under development and is expected to be available in 2001. That assessment is being constructed to be used for the purposes of initial identification, measurement of ELD performance, instructional placement and redesignation. In the meantime, districts are to select their own ELD measures.

available, districts should consider appropriate accommodations when assessing EL students via English medium procedures (See Appendix A).

E. When assessments are available both in English and the primary language, districts should establish procedures regarding the determination of the language(s) to be used for the assessment of individual students in English, the primary language, or in both languages (See Appendix B).

"The greatest of all gifts is the power to estimate things at their true worth."
— La Rochefoucauld

III. DATA COLLECTION

Developing a well-articulated, comprehensive data collection process which includes the systematic gathering of data elements related to assessment results, student background factors, and programmatic variables in ways which will allow appropriate data analyses of student achievement patterns and program effectiveness

A. School districts must have the capability to conduct analyses of EL and immigrant student performance data in relation to critical student background and programmatic variables. Without such analyses, districts will not be able to make accurate determinations of (1) whether or not EL, former EL, and immigrant students eventually acquire English and achieve grade level academic standards, and (2) which instructional programs and services contribute to student achievement or to the lack of adequate student progress.

B. In addition to the assessment results (scores/ratings), information should be collected on:

1. The names and versions of the assessments used
2. The dates of administration
3. The language(s) used to conduct the assessment

C. Essential background variables for EL, former EL, and immigrant students include data such as:

1. Date of First Enrollment in a U.S. school (Date of Identification as English Learner if Different)
2. Home Language(s)
3. Place of Birth/Country of Origin
4. Date of Redesignation
5. Schooling History

For examples of how to collect these data, please refer to Appendix C.

D. To discern the effects of specific instructional treatments, collection of data on additional programmatic variables will be required. Examples of these variables include:

1. Program Placement
2. Teacher Assignment
3. Medium of Instruction
4. Course Schedule History

For examples of how to document these variables in a data collection system, please refer to Appendix C.

E. The district should establish a data collection system that includes procedures for assigning and properly training data collectors. Training should include data collection and entry processes and procedures to validate data files.

"Knowledge is power."
— Thomas Hobbes

IV. DATA MANAGEMENT

Managing data in ways that allow for (1) the aggregation of certain data elements in order to articulate the use of multiple measures and (2) the disaggregation of other data elements to produce analyses according to critical student background and programmatic variables

A. Districts must develop a protocol to combine multiple measures in order to determine the overall level of student performance in a particular subject. The following example illustrates how an analysis of grades and norm referenced test (NRT) results can yield a judgement of whether a student meets grade-level standards. A student's low performance on one measure can be offset by high performance on another. However, no student who scores below established cut-offs should be considered as meeting grade-level standards.

NRT Scores (percentiles)

Grades	1-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+
A						
B						
C						
D						
F						

[Shaded areas indicate attainment of the grade-level standard]

B. Performance data should be disaggregated by various cohorts of students to determine if individual EL and immigrant students and groups of EL, former EL, and immigrant students are making adequate progress toward meeting district standards.

Suggested cohorts include:

1. District, school, and grade level or grade span
2. Language classification: English Learner (EL), Initially Fluent-English Proficient (I-FEP), Redesignated Fluent-English Proficient (R-FEP)
3. Home language and national origin group
4. Length of time in program (duration of treatment, date of enrollment)
5. Program treatment (type and amount)
6. School attendance factors (e.g., late entry and interrupted schooling)

C. Whenever districts use multiple measures to determine student performance for a single subject area, data on each of the multiple measures used to determine this performance should be maintained independently. Examples of these types of data are contained in Appendix D of this document.

D. Proper disaggregation of data is dependent upon having an adequate number (N) of students in a specific cohort or sample. Usually an N of fewer than 15 students is considered to be too small for proper analyses.

"Though this be madness, yet there is method in't."
— Shakespeare

V. ANALYSES AND REPORTING

Developing adequate reports for various audiences and determining patterns in student performance and program effectiveness through analyses and syntheses

A. Reports should be customized in content and presentation to meet the unique needs of different audiences such as (1) regulatory agencies, (2) funding agencies, (3) local district and school staff, (4) local board of education, and (5) parents and community at both the district and school levels.

B. A thorough analysis of the data by administrators and teachers should be conducted to determine the quality and significance of the data collected. Sub-test scores and item analyses of norm-referenced tests can be useful. Comparison of scores on school-developed rubrics by year and cohort (grade and English proficiency levels) should be conducted to determine the correlation with other measures.

C. While reports should include the district's/school's interpretations of the outcomes, sufficient performance data should be contained in the reports to allow readers to make their own analyses and draw their own conclusions.

D. Information in annual reports should include, for each subject area of the core curriculum, the number and types of students enrolled and assessed by school, in each grade level, for each language group, and according to year-in-program.

Watch Out for the Lamppost Syndrome!

Sometimes evaluation reports are like lampposts. You can see only what the light exposes even though the more important information may lie outside of the light's range. This often happens with reports on the achievement of English learners.

For example, if a district were to report that the average performance of English learners is the 25th percentile, we shouldn't jump to the conclusions that students who start school initially as limited in English are performing at the 25th percentile nor that the program of instruction is systematically failing the EL students.

> *One point everyone seems upset about is the low scores attained by LEP students. Such worries are misdirected. Every law of logic and common sense dictates that a new immigrant child who has not learned English is going to perform poorly on a test meant to measure proficiency in the very language he does not know. Thus the scores of genuine LEP students will always and forever remain well below the scores of kids who know English, no matter how great the school system or how committed to education the family may be. What's at stake here is not raising the LEP scores per se, which is by definition impossible, but teaching immigrant kids English and . . . making sure they do not fall behind in the other subjects.* (Roger Hernandez, **Los Angeles Times**, August 1, 1999).

First, the reporting of the average percentile does not take into account the proportion of English learners who are new to the program each year. Secondly, during the first couple of years of enrollment, NRTs administered in English do not provide a valid and reliable picture of the performance of English learners. Finally, such reports exclude the results of the highest achieving cohort of English learners, those pupils who have been redesignated as fluent in English.

A more accurate approach would be to analyze the cumulative effects of the program of instruction by disaggregating the achievement results for English learners and former English learners based on the number of years of enrollment in the program. This would provide a longitudinal perspective on the performance of all of those students who initially enroll in school as limited in English.

"Nine-tenths of wisdom is being wise in time."
— Theodore Roosevelt

VI. USE OF STUDENT AND PROGRAM INFORMATION

Using student and program data for accountability purposes and to improve program effectiveness

The primary purposes of conducting an evaluation of program effectiveness are to hold schools and programs accountable for student performance and to modify practices to improve student learning. The data collected and analyses conducted should assist school personnel to develop responses to a number of basic questions such as: (a) Is the program being implemented as planned? (b) Are English learners, former English learners, and immigrant students acquiring English and learning the core curriculum? (c) Are these students learning at acceptable rates? (d) Are the various instructional practices being used in the program the most effective with these students? and (e) What improvements should be made?

In responding to these and other basic questions, a collaborative process, including administrators, teachers, and the community, should be developed. ***The goal should be to develop and maintain high quality instructional programs and services for English learners, former English learners, and immigrant students that allow these students, within a reasonable amount of time, to achieve the same challenging grade level and graduation standards, in the same proportion, as mainstream students.*** Developing a collaborative effort to effectively utilize program evaluation data is no easy task.

> *Meaningful and thoughtful use of data, unfortunately, runs counter to the workings of most schools. Many of us have had bad experiences with data being used to blame or manipulate us for political ends. Few educators have had the time or training to learn how to use data effectively for their own purposes. As a result, too few advocates use data to develop responsive programs and focus their work. Far too many schools spin their wheels in ineffective reform attempts, never seeing or correcting the exclusion and inequities that exist (Johnson 1996; Olsen 1996).* (Taken from **Turning the Tides of Exclusion, A Guide for Educators and Advocates for Immigrant Students**, Laurie Olsen and Ann Jaramillo, California Tomorrow, Oakland, 1999, p.107).

To avoid these problems school personnel will need to prepare themselves and the school community to not only effectively evaluate the program, but to also use the evaluation data in ways that actually result in meaningful improvements in the school program. Approaches might include tapping resources in the school district's evaluation department, developing an agreement with a local university, or employing a private evaluator. Regardless of the approach taken, the various parties involved in the collaboration must agree upon a core of common understandings.

In Chapter Three of **Turning the Tides of Exclusion, A Guide for Educators and Advocates for Immigrant Students** (entitled "Opening the Door to Data and Inquiry"), the authors provide a step by step guide on the effective use of data. Using a guide, such as the one from the California Tomorrow Organization, is one way to begin the preparation process. That guide is exceptional in that it not only contains excellent information on data use and inquiry, but also presents this and other related information in the context of serving language minority and immigrant student populations. One of the serious shortcomings of evaluations conducted on

programs which serve English learner and immigrant students is that often the staff conducting the evaluations either (1) are capable in evaluation approaches, but unfamiliar with minority student educational programs, or conversely (2) are unskilled in evaluation, but experienced in programs for English learners and immigrant pupils.

The California Tomorrow Organization, a non-profit group, also enters into collaborations with schools, districts, and other educational organizations to develop long-term, comprehensive efforts to improve school programs for immigrant students. For more information on publications and technical assistance services contact Laurie Olsen, Project Director, at (510) 496-0220, Web page: http://www.californiatomorrow.org[4].

Another helpful publication is the handbook developed by the Southern California Comprehensive Assistance Center at the Los Angeles County Office of Education entitled **Data Collection & Program Improvement for English Language Learners** (1998). This guide contains detailed explanations and examples. For further information, contact Shelly Spiegel Coleman, Project Coordinator at (562) 922-6332, e-mail: spiegel-coleman_shelly@lacoe.edu. Also of interest is a monograph produced by California Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development entitled **Databases Can Help Teachers With Standards Implementation** (Victoria Burnhardt, June 1999)[5]

Districts are encouraged to develop evaluation and accountability systems for programs and schools which will allow them to answer the basic questions about the program which are considered to be priorities by the school community. Examples of the questions and corresponding evaluation elements are provided in outline format in the following section.

A. Districts/schools should establish a process and criteria to determine the effectiveness of the program provided for EL, former EL, and immigrant students. For example, what are the annual benchmarks and what is the reasonable period of time established for students to achieve ELD standards and grade level standards in the core curriculum?

B. Districts /schools should provide reports which document the extent to which programs and services to EL, former EL, and immigrant students were actually implemented and the extent to which individual pupils actually participated in these programs overtime (See Appendix C for samples of how to document these factors).

C. The evaluation of the effectiveness of the English language development instruction should be guided by how well EL students are learning to speak, read, and write English. Are English Learners acquiring English language skills, including academic English proficiency? At what rate are EL students becoming fully proficient in English? Data need to be collected, analyzed, and summarized in relation to these principal questions and any secondary questions that are appropriate. For example, secondary questions might include: (a) What are the differences in the adjusted mean scores on district selected objective measures between one test period and another? (b) What does the data demonstrate regarding the progress of English Learners toward redesignation? and/or (c) What is the

[4] California Tomorrow Organization, 436 14th Street, Suite 820, Oakland, CA 94612. FAX (510) 496-0225.
[5] CASCD, P.O. Box 6630, Los Osos, CA 93412. Tel. (800) 660-9899.

correlation between the district's redesignation criteria and the performance of redesignated students in the mainstream English language curriculum?

D. The evaluation of the core curriculum should be guided by how well EL, former EL and immigrant students are mastering the core subjects such as mathematics, science, and social science, irrespective of their current level of English proficiency. The analyses should reveal any academic deficits that may have been incurred by the pupils during the English acquisition process.

Special Note: State and federal laws require that EL students attain English language proficiency comparable to that of average native speakers of English in the district and that EL students achieve academic parity with students who enter the school system already proficient in English. A school district may establish programs for EL students which employ either a simultaneous (concurrent) or sequential presentation and development of ELD and core curricular subjects. However, whenever EL students incur academic deficits, districts are required to implement a catch-up plan so that, on an accelerated basis, the EL students are able to recoup any academic deficits and perform at grade level standards.

E. Districts should use student performance data to determine if individual English learners have met grade level promotional standards or conversely to determine if these students are at risk of being retained. Further information on Pupil Promotion and Retention is available at the CDE web site: http://www.cde.ca.gov/ppr/.

F. In developing basic questions about language minority and immigrant students, consider if these students are:

1. Acquiring English language proficiency and being redesignated at the expected rates?
2. Learning the core curriculum as indicated by district benchmarks?
3. Receiving access to higher level learning opportunities as measured by participation in GATE, honors, and advanced placement courses?
4. Being promoted or retained and graduating at expected rates?
5. Attending school at expected rates?

G. In gathering data, consider:

1. English language proficiency:

- Disaggregation of scores by proficiency and grade levels
- Individual matched scores
- Individual scores disaggregated by time in program and type of program
- Numbers and percent of English Learners being redesignated by time in program and type of program

2. Progress in learning the core curriculum:

   - School scores disaggregated by grade level English proficiency level, and time in program
   - Individual matched pre and post-test scores

3. High school graduation and college preparation rates:

   - Numbers and percentage of English Learners and immigrant pupils fulfilling graduation requirements by school, time in program, and beginning English proficiency level
   - Percentage of these students fulfilling graduation and A-F requirements who are/were English Learners and immigrant students.

4. Attendance rates:

   - Attendance rate of English Learners and immigrant students compared to mainstream students
   - Number of English Learners and immigrant students missing school during
   - identified periods of absence (agricultural seasons, ethnic holidays, first month of school, etc.)
   - Attendance rate of English learners and immigrant students by type of program

H. In analyzing the data:

1. Organize data to facilitate analyses by school, language groups, grade levels

   - Provide school reports disaggregated by grade, language group, language proficiency, time in program, type of program, etc.
   - Provide district reports comparing overall results disaggregated by grade, language groups, time in program, type of program, etc.

2. Summarize the data in response to each of the basic questions

3. Synthesize conclusions about the effectiveness of the program

   - Draw conclusions taking into account appropriate statistical adjustments and analyses
   - Make recommendations for program continuation or improvement after a thorough discussion of the conclusions

I. In planning program modifications:

1. Use the data analyses as a guide for planning improved programs.

2. Develop an action plan for using the conclusions reached regarding the effectiveness of the program.

3. Through the collaborative process, administrators, teachers, and the community should identify and implement program modifications based on the conclusions reached through data analyses.

"I do not believe in a fate that falls on persons however they act; but I do believe in a fate that falls on them unless they act."
— Gilbert K. Chesterton

"A fool knows the price of everything and the value of nothing."
— Oscar Wilde

Appendix - A

Suggested Standardized Assessment Approaches

While districts are required to use the assessments adopted as part of the STAR program as one component of their accountability framework, they may choose to enhance their evaluation and accountability system by using a variety of assessment approaches. Given the complexities of assessing students from non-English language backgrounds, the evaluation requirements stemming from various state and federal agencies and programs, and the need to collect and use evaluation data to improve program delivery, districts and schools need a comprehensive assessment program to determine the language and academic standing of their EL, former EL, and immigrant students. Some recommended assessment approaches include:

- Alternative Assessments in the Primary Language
- Accommodations with English Medium Assessments
- Targeted Second Language Assessments
- Differential Assessments

1. Alternative Assessments in the Primary Language

By definition, EL students do not have the English language proficiency necessary to be assessed properly by instruments and procedures originally designed for native speakers of English. Consequently, assessment through *comparable* procedures in the primary language of EL students is indicated whenever such assessments would result in a more accurate measurement of student performance. Guidance to determine the language of assessment for individual pupils is provided in Appendix B.

2. Accommodations with English Medium Assessments

When it is not possible to assess EL students in their primary language because no assessments through comparable procedures in the primary language exist or because individual EL students do not have sufficient levels of primary language proficiency to be assessed by instruments developed for native speakers, districts may consider the use of English medium assessment procedures and employ one or more standardized accommodations.

Some types of accommodations that are used include, but are not limited to:

- Use of customized, bilingual glossaries or dictionaries
- Allowance of additional test-taking time
- Small group or individualized administration
- Assistance by bilingual proctors

Districts are advised that little research is available regarding the effects of using different types of assessment accommodations with non-English background students. Certainly such practices influence the validity of assessment outcomes. Also, reliability can be greatly influenced by the variability of practices on the part of personnel assigned to administer selected accommodations. Yet, simply using a standardized test normed on mainstream students without any accommodations for EL and immigrant students will not yield valid and reliable results. Providing EL and immigrant students with dictionaries or glossaries is a relatively unobtrusive accommodation. Providing additional test time to the foreign born, has been shown in research studies, to improve the performance of English learners and immigrant individuals without effecting the outcomes of mainstream test takers.

Note that while the use of accommodations may be recommended for English medium assessments selected as part of local accountability systems, accommodations may not be used when administering state mandated assessments such as the SAT-9 or SABE[2].

3. Targeted Second Language Assessments

In some cases, it is appropriate to use specially designed targeted procedures to assess instructional areas such as English language development. An example would be the statewide ELD assessment which is being designed exclusively for English Learners to assess their progress in acquiring English as a second language and meeting the state ELD standards.

4. Differential Assessments

Most EL and immigrant students should be able to effectively participate in one or more of the assessment approaches (1-3) listed in this appendix. There are, however, some EL and immigrant students, especially among those who are recent arrivals to the United States, who, for their age and expected grade level, are severely under-schooled. Frequently, these students have not developed the literacy and test taking skills necessary to participate in grade-level, formal assessment procedures, even in their native language. For this particular group of EL and immigrant students, the district may wish to establish differential, *en route*, informal assessment procedures aligned to their specified instructional program (e.g., initial literacy instruction for under-schooled, late entrant, secondary school students).

Appendix - B

Determining the Language(s) of Assessment for Individual English Learners

School s are being asked to assess each an every pupil on at least an annual basis. In the case of English learners, a number of complex issues must be addressed. One of these issues is determining the language(s) that will be used to assess individual EL students. This section is intended to guide teachers and other educators in making this important decision. Three topics will be discussed: (1) assessing language arts and language development, (2) assessing other core curricular subjects such as mathematics, science, and social science, and (3) special circumstances.

English Language Development and Language Arts

By definition, English learners do not possess sufficient proficiency in English to participate fully in the regular English Language Arts curriculum. In fact, state and federal laws require that all EL students be provided with English Language Development (ELD) which is defined as a course of study addressing comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing using a curriculum and instructional methods appropriate for second language learners. During the time that English learners are enrolled in ELD, it is expected that they will be assessed primarily, if not exclusively in this subject area through the medium of English, using assessments which are aligned with the ELD Standards.

Concurrent and sometimes continuing subsequent to their enrollment in ELD, many EL students are enrolled in Primary Language Arts (e.g., Spanish Language Arts). These and other EL students also may have received significant amounts of Language Arts instruction previously in their home countries. For these students, assessment of their status and progress in Primary Language Arts should be administered through the medium of their primary language as long as they are enrolled in this course of study.

Eventually, English learners will be redesignated as fluent-English Proficient (R-FEP) and placed in a mainstream English Language Arts course of study. At this point, the former EL students may be assessed with the regular district adopted test to determine progress in the mainstream English Language Arts curriculum.

Other Core Curricular Subjects

The purpose of core curricular assessment is to determine a student's performance in a specific subject matter such as mathematics, science, or social science. In most cases, assessments should be administered in the language in which individual English learners are best able to demonstrate their ability in a subject.

Previous educational experiences, current language proficiencies, current medium of instruction, and recent scholastic experiences are all factors that should be considered when making the

determination of language of assessment. The steps outlined in the following section show one way that information about the student can be organized to assist in making assessment decisions:

Steps to Determine Language(s) of Assessment

Step 1: *How long has the student been enrolled in school in the United States? Remember EL Spanish-speaking students who have been enrolled in a U.S. School for one year or less must be assessed with the SABE[2] in addition to the SAT 9. Administration of primary language medium assessments for other purposes is optional on the part of the school district.*

Step 2: *Review previous assessments and observations of the student's English and primary language proficiencies. What does this information tell you about the ability of the student to take an exam in English or the primary language? Also look at the students' previous schooling experiences. How many years did the students attend school in their home country?*

Step 3: *In the U.S.A., has the student been enrolled in a particular subject in a program which provided instruction through the primary language, specially designed academic instruction in English, or through mainstream English? What observations do teachers have about the student's progress and participation in particular courses? The general guideline would be to match the language used as a medium of instruction in a particular course with the language used to assess that subject matter.*

In most cases, analyzing the factors listed in these steps will provide staff with the information necessary to make a decision about the language(s) of assessment. There will however be some English learner and assessment contexts for which the choice of language(s) of assessment is not so clearly evident. In these cases, it may be necessary initially to assess some students in both the primary language and in English to ascertain which assessment approach yields the most accurate outcomes. When students are assessed in both languages, it is recommended that independent, but comparable versions of the assessment be administered separately.

Special Circumstances

In contrast to almost every other group of students (with the notable exception of homeless youth), there are significant numbers of English learners (including migrant and immigrant pupils) who have missed many months or even years of schooling. In some cases, students come from very rural settings in their home countries where schooling is not available. In other instances, schooling is interrupted by natural disasters, civil wars, or the immigration process. Sometimes families live in such abject poverty that they may not have the means to send their children to school. Whatever the reasons, there often are some English learners enrolled at every grade level who have received significantly less schooling than their other classmates. The practice of administering grade-level assessments to such students, whether in English or the primary language, is questionable. Most of these students are unlikely to have the prerequisite literacy, scholastic, and social development necessary to participate fully. For these students,

differential assessment procedures (e.g., portfolios rated by teachers using rubrics) should be considered for use in lieu of, or in addition to, more formalized measures. Similar considerations should be given to some English learners who are identified as having special educational needs.

Summary

Generally, EL and immigrant students should be assessed in ELD and English Language Arts through English and assessed in Primary Language Arts through the primary language. In subject matter courses such as mathematics, science, social science, and health, individual EL and immigrant students should be assessed through the language in which they can best demonstrate their knowledge of the subject matter. Often this will be the same language as that used as the medium of instruction for the particular course, however, for EL and immigrant students with considerable previous schooling experiences in their primary language, they may be able to demonstrate knowledge better through a primary language assessment during the first couple of years in the U.S., even though English may be the current medium of instruction. In some cases, lack of previous schooling may preclude some EL and immigrant students from participating in regular, formalized assessments in English or the primary language. For these students, differential assessment procedures may be warranted.

"There is but one way of seeing things rightly and that is seeing the whole of them."
— John Ruskin

Appendix – C

Collecting Data on Assessment Results, Student Factors, and Program Variables

This appendix contains examples of how data on assessment results, student background factors, and program variables such as language of instruction, can be collected and organized.

1. Student Identification

Accurately recording the full name and date of birth of a student and linking these to an identification number developed by the school district will ensure that data will be properly recorded and analyzed for each student.

Table 1 - Student Identification Data

Row	Data Type		
01	Family (Surname) Name _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _	First (Given) Name _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _	Second (Given) Name _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _
02	Month of Birth _ _	Day of Birth _ _	Year of Birth _ _
03	ID Number _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _		

Instructions for Table 1:

Name. In row one enter the student's family name (surname), first given name, and second given name. For example, Juan Marco Echeverry would be entered as:
[E c h e v e r r y] [J u a n] [M a r c o].

Birth Date. In row two, enter two digits each for the month, day, and year to represent the date of birth of the student. For example April 1, 1986 would be entered as: [04] [01] [86].

ID Number. In row three, enter the proper number of digits to indicate the student's district identification number. For example, if the district uses a seven digit numbering scheme, student number 5125 would be entered as [0 0 0 5 1 2 5].

2. Language Classification

The information associated with the initial classification and redesignation of students will allow districts to analyze data according to the current language classification as well as the length of time a student is classified as an English learner (LEP). The necessary data elements are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2 - Language Status and Date of Classification and Redesignation

Row	Classification	Status Code	Date (MM/ DD/ YY)
01	Primary Language	__ __	
02	Initial Classification	__ __	__/__/__
03	Redesignation	__ __	__/__/__

Instructions for Table 2:

Primary Language. In row one, enter the two digit code which corresponds to the student's primary language. Use the language group codes from the Language Census (Form R-30). The primary language information is collected on the *Home Language Survey.*

Initial Classification. In row two, enter the two digit code that corresponds to the student's initial language classification. Also enter the date on which this determination was made.

01 = Monolingual English - Primary language is English
02 = I-FEP, Initially Fluent-English Proficient - Primary language is other than English
03 = EL, English Learner (LEP) - Primary language is other than English

Redesignation. In row three, enter the two-digit code which corresponds to the student's redesignation status. If the student has been redesignated, enter the date on which this occurred.

04 = R-FEP, Redesignated Fluent English Proficient - formerly classified as EL
00 = Blank, means a student has not been redesignated

3. Schooling History

By collecting information on the previous schooling experiences of EL and immigrant students, districts will be able to disaggregate data by (1) number of years of previous schooling, (2) attendance and grade-level promotion/retention, and (3) location of enrollment. Table 3 shows one way these data can be organized.

Table 3 - Schooling History

Row	Grade Level	Year Completed	Retention	School Code	Multiple Enrollment
01	Preschool				
02	Kindergarten				
03	First Grade				
04	Second Grade				
05	Third Grade				
06	Fourth Grade				
07	Fifth Grade				
08	Sixth Grade				
09	Seventh Grade				
10	Eighth Grade				
11	Ninth Grade				
12	Tenth Grade				
13	Eleventh Grade				
14	Twelfth Grade				

Instructions for Table 3:

Year Completed. In the first column, enter all four digits that correspond to the year that the student completed the grade level in question. For example, if the student completed preschool in June of 1993, enter [1 9 9 3] in row 01. When a grade level is repeated, enter the year of successful completion. For instance, if a student enrolled in the first grade in 1994-95 and then repeated the class in 1995-96, enter [1 9 9 6] in row 03. If the student did not enroll in school in a particular grade level or the student did not complete the grade level successfully, enter [0 0 0 0] in the appropriate row.

Retention. For each grade level at which the student was retained, enter [0 1] in the second column. Grade levels not repeated should be designated as [0 0].

School Code. In the school code column, enter the two digit identifier which corresponds to the location codes below. When a student attends more than one school during a year, enter the location of longest attendance.

01 = Current school	04 = Other school in USA	09 = Not known
02 = Other school this district	05 = School in another country	
03 = Other California school	06 = Not enrolled in any school	

Multiple Enrollment. Enter a number between 01 and 09 which corresponds to the number of schools attended by the student during the same school year. If the student was not enrolled in school, enter 00.

4. Medium of Instruction

Collecting the data in Table 4 will permit analyses of data according to media of instruction, degree of implementation, duration of treatment and staffing. These data will also identify the grade levels of intervention and the consistency of the program treatment. Table 4 shows one way that these data may be organized.

Table 4 - Medium of Instruction

Grade Level		Preschool	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Enter data for grades 7-12 in a similar manner
Row	Subject									
01	ELD									
02	English Lang. Arts									
03	Primary Lang. Arts									
04	Math									
05	Soc. Science									
06	Science									
07	Health									
08	Other Core Subject									
09	Elective									

Instructions for Table 4:

Courses. For each course (subject) completed at each grade level, enter the code that most closely corresponds to the medium of instruction used to deliver the course content.

00 = ELD
01 = Mainstream English Medium (same delivery as used with native speakers of English)
02 = Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE)
03 = SDAIE with Primary Language Support
04 = Primary Language (L_1)
05 = Other (describe)
06 = Medium not known
07 = Not enrolled in course

Use codes 00, 01, 02, and 03 only when a qualified teacher (not aides, volunteers or cross-age tutors) provide the instruction.

5. Documenting Instructional Treatments

Each instructional treatment for English learners should be documented in terms of its curricular offerings. The offerings can be organized by year-in-program or as shown in Table 5, according to the ELD proficiency levels of the program participants.

Table 5 - Program Treatment Descriptions

	Two-Way	Bilingual Education	Sheltered Instruction
ELD – Beginning Level	ELD Spanish Lang. Arts Math PL Social Studies PL Science PL or SDAIE	ELD Spanish Lang. Arts Math PL Social Studies PL Science SDAIE	ELD ELD Expanded Math SDAIE Social Studies SDAIE Science SDAIE
ELD – Early Intermediate	ELD Spanish Lang. Arts Math PL Social Studies PL Science PL or SDAIE	ELD Spanish Lang. Arts Math PL Social Studies PL Science SDAIE	ELD ELD Expanded Math SDAIE Social Studies SDAIE Science SDAIE
ELD – Intermediate	ELD Spanish Lang. Arts Math SDAIE Social Studies PL Science SDAIE	ELD Spanish Lang. Arts Math PL or SDAIE Social Studies PL Science SDAIE	ELD English Lang. Arts SDAIE Math SDAIE Social Studies SDAIE Science SDAIE
ELD – Early Advanced	ELD Spanish Lang. Arts Math SDAIE Social Studies PL Science SDAIE	ELD Spanish Lang. Arts Math SDAIE Social Studies SDAIE Science SDAIE	ELD English Lang. Arts SDAIE Math Mainstream English Social Studies SDAIE Science Mainstream English
ELD – Advanced	ELD English Lang. Arts SDAIE Spanish Language Arts Math Mainstream Social Studies PL Science Mainstream	ELD English Lang. Arts SDAIE Elective Mainstream Math Mainstream Social Studies Mainstream Science Mainstream	English Lang. Arts SDAIE Eng. Lang. Arts Expanded Elective Mainstream Math Mainstream Social Studies Mainstream Science Mainstream
Fluent English Proficient	Spanish Lang. Arts Social Studies PL or Elective PL All Other Classes in Mainstream Format	All Mainstream Classes	All Mainstream Classes

Key: ELD=English Language Development, SDAIE=Specially-Designed Academic Instruction in English, and PL=Primary Language Medium.

6. Documenting Participation in Instructional Treatments

Using information collected on individual students (such as that collected in Table 4), and analyzing that against the program descriptions (such as those in Table 5) staff will be able to categorize the instructional treatment provided to individual pupils during each year of enrollment.

Table 6 - Participation in Instructional Treatments

Year	Grade Level	Type of Instructional Treatment Code
— — — —	Preschool Yr 1	
— — — —	Preschool Yr 2	
— — — —	Kindergarten	
— — — —	Kindergarten, Repeated	
— — — —	First Grade	
— — — —	First Grade, Repeated	
— — — —	Second Grade	
— — — —	Second Grade, Repeated	
— — — —	Third Grade	
— — — —	Third Grade, Repeated	
— — — —	Fourth Grade	
— — — —	Fourth Grade, Repeated	
— — — —	Fifth Grade	
— — — —	Fifth Grade, Repeated	
— — — —	Sixth Grade	
— — — —	Sixth Grade, Repeated	

Instructions for Table 6:

Codes for Instructional Treatments

1 = Two-way Bilingual Immersion Education
2 = Bilingual Education
3 = Sheltered Instruction
4 = Unknown or None (No instructional services for English learner students were documented for this pupil for the school year)
5 = Not Enrolled (Not enrolled in school during this school year)

Appendix – D

Reporting on Student Performance

Appendix D contains various examples of tables that can be developed to display different types of student performance data. These examples are provided for training purposes only.

1. Example of two contrasting views of the SAT 9 data on Language Minority Pupils

SAT 9 Reading Data/Language Minority Students

The traditional way of presenting norm-referenced test (NRT) data is to provide test scores disaggregated by grade level on an annual basis for English Learners as a group.

Accountability Objective: At least 90 percent of the English Learners will attain grade level performance (50 NCE or better) annually.

Table 1 - SAT 9 Reading 1999, EL Students in Grades 2-8
Traditional View

Grade Level	N Students Assessed	NPR Average	Percent Meeting Criteria (=or>50 NCE)
2	582	26	27
3	480	20	21
4	414	19	17
5	403	18	16
6	281	19	11
7	260	16	7
8	223	15	5
Total	2643	18	18

Note: NPR stands for National Percentile Rank.

Analysis: Students did not meet the criterion at any grade level. There is a consistent trend of severe underachievement, which appears to be more profound in the upper grades. However, staff have noted that many of the EL students in this sample are recent arrivals and omitted from the sample are those EL students who have been redesignated as fluent in English.

Conclusions: No conclusions should be drawn from these data until further analyses are conducted. For example, since research indicates that English learners take from two to seven years to acquire academic levels of English proficiency and since the district knows that many of the immigrant students are under-schooled, it would be prudent to reanalyze the SAT 9 Reading scores for EL students by disaggregating the data by time-in-program and including in the analysis, the scores of former EL students.

Table 2 - Reanalysis of 1999 SAT 9 Reading Data
English Learners and Former English Learners by Time-In-Program
Longitudinal View

Year of Initial Enrollment	N of Students	Annual Benchmark Objective	Percent of EL Students Meeting Annual Benchmark	Percent of All Students Meeting Standard (50 NCE or better)
1999	700 EL and 25 Former EL	25th NCE	35	08
1998	600 EL and 100 Former EL	30th NCE	40	35
1997	450 EL and 150 Former EL	35th NCE	45	42
1996	325 EL and 200 Former EL	40th NCE	50	47
1995	250 EL and 225 Former EL	45th NCE	45	61
1994	175 EL and 225 Former EL	50th NCE	40	70
1993 or Before	100 EL and 200 Former EL	50th NCE	35	78

Analysis: Over time, the performance of pupils initially identified as English learners (current English learners and former English learners) improves dramatically. By the fourth year of instruction, the pupils, as a group, have approximated the grade level standard. Subsequently, the group maintains performance at or above the standard.

Conclusions: The lower achievement in the first year or two of enrollment may be spurious, an effect of using a test normed on native speakers of English with non-English background students. Many of the pupils initially classified as English learners eventually reach or surpass the 50th NCE on the SAT 9; however, as a group, only 78 percent eventually reach this standard by the seventh year of the program. This is 12 percent below the district's 90 percent criterion. Teachers report that many slow readers in the beginning grades are not receiving the remedial services they need in English or their primary language. Teachers believe that there is also a negative trend among late entrant students (grades 4-8). Some enter school a year or more below

grade level and are unable to catch up. Additional analyses of the data are needed to determine if additional instructional interventions may be needed for these two types of students.

"Bank on the long-term trends and ignore the tremors."
— J. Paul Getty

2. Example of reporting teacher observational data by year in program.

English Language Development - EL Students

Each spring, classroom teachers observe individual EL students and rate their level of English language communicative proficiency according to the *Student Oral Language Observation Matrix* (SOLOM). The SOLOM scores range from 5 to 25. The results in Table 3 are from May 1999.

Accountability Objective: 90 percent of EL students will meet annual benchmark objectives and by the end of the fourth year of ELD instruction, 90 percent of the EL students will attain a rating of Fluent in English (score of 20 or better) on the SOLOM.

Table 3 - SOLOM Results for EL Students by Year of Instruction

No. of Years of Instruction	N of EL and Former EL Students	Annual Benchmark Objectives	Percent Meeting Annual Benchmark	Percent Meeting Fluent Standard
1	625	8	85	5
2	500	12	92	15
3	450	15	95	50
4	400	18	90	80
5	390	20+	92	92

ANALYSIS: EL students as a group are meeting both benchmark and district objectives. Of the first-year students, 15 percent failed to meet the benchmark objective, and only 5 percent met the district's standard. By the end of the fifth year, however, 358 students, or 92 percent, met the district's standard of 20 or better on the SOLOM. This is consistent with expectations based on research, in that, although few EL students met the district standard in the first few years of enrollment, within a reasonable period of time (three-five years) the pupils, as a group, not only achieved the objective, but went on to surpass the standard.

CONCLUSIONS: As a group, EL students are acquiring oral English fluency over a period of one to five years with the majority of children reaching oral fluency by the fourth year of enrollment. By the end of the fifth year, almost all EL students are fluent. Further analyses are needed on the remaining 8 percent of EL pupils who do not reach fluent oral language levels by the fifth year to determine which student background characteristics or programmatic variables are associated with their underperformance.

3. Additional examples of reporting norm-referenced standardized test data by grade level.

Primary Language Arts

All first year EL students who are Spanish-speaking and those EL Spanish-speaking students enrolled in Primary Language Arts as part of the Two-Way Bilingual Program are administered the *SABE*[2] examination, which measures literacy skills in Spanish. The results displayed in Table 4 are from the May 1999 administration of the *SABE*[2].

Accountability Objective: At least 90 percent of students enrolled in Spanish language arts will attain grade-level performance (50th NCE or better) annually.

Table 4 - EL Spanish-Speaking Students - *SABE*[2] Results by Grade Level, 1-6

Grade Level	N of Students	N Assessed	Mean NCE	Percent Meeting Criteria (50th NCE or Better)
1	375	355	55	75
2	350	330	60	80
3	325	305	59	80
4	300	280	55	76
5	275	255	50	70
6	250	230	47	65

ANALYSIS: The students fail to meet the 90 percent criterion at every grade level. This analysis seems to indicate that the Spanish reading instruction is producing only mediocre results. In fact, there appears to be a slight decline in the performance of the group over time.

CONCLUSIONS: The data in Table 4 raise doubts regarding the effectiveness of the Two-Way Bilingual Program to adequately develop the Spanish language literacy skills of participants. Some administrators have suggested that the Two-Way Bilingual Program be discontinued and that all Spanish-speaking EL students be placed in Structured English Immersion. The data in Table 4 do not necessarily support the position of the administrators; however, a further analysis of the *SABE*[2] data, disaggregated by year of enrollment in the Spanish reading program, may

shed some light on student achievement patterns. Including the scores of former English learners who continue to be enrolled in Spanish Language Arts and disaggregation of the data by year-in-program should provide a clearer picture of program effectiveness.

Table 5 - Reanalysis of *SABE*[2] Results
English Learners and Former English Learners
By Year-In-Program

Year of Initial Enrollment	N of Students	Mean NCE	Percent Meeting Criteria (50th NCE or Better)
1999			
English Learners	700	27	20
Former ELs	025	60	93
1998			
English Learners	400	45	55
Former ELs	050	58	85
1997			
English Learners	375	55	60
Former ELs	100	60	88
1996			
English Learners	250	60	65
Former ELs	155	65	90
1995			
English Learners	175	62	67
Former ELs	175	68	94
1994 and Before			
English Learners	75	50	60
Former ELs	200	75	87

Analysis: These data appear to indicate that first year students especially, are performing very poorly; however, as EL and former EL students continue in the Two-Way Bilingual Program, performance improves dramatically. The performance of former English learners is exceptional.

Conclusions: For those Spanish-speaking pupils enrolled in the Two-Way Bilingual Program, most are making adequate progress in literacy. Spanish instruction is serving not only as a basis for future literacy instruction in English but Spanish literacy development is also allowing pupils to attain and utilize higher order thinking and learning skills sooner in their academic careers. Further analyses are needed to refine these conclusions.

Clearly, first year Spanish-speaking EL students not enrolled in Spanish Language Arts are not developing and may be rapidly losing Spanish language proficiency. There is also a disconcerting trend of underachievement among a smaller number of EL students who remain below the 50th NCE even after several years of instruction in the Two-Way Bilingual Program. Further analysis might shed light on the achievement patterns of (1) those pupils who did not attend preschool or (2) the late entrant students who enter school well below grade level in Spanish reading and may need intensive, accelerated, compensatory literacy development.

4. Example of using grade point average (GPA) to report mathematics achievement.

Secondary Mathematics Achievement

To bolster the standardized mathematics assessments available in grades 10-12, the district also measures achievement by calculating individual and group GPAs for specific mathematics courses such as Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Calculus, and Statistics.

Accountability Objective: At least 90 percent of students will receive a GPA of 2.0 or better in their mathematics courses in grades 10-12.

Table 6 - Mathematics GPA for Various Student Cohorts, Grades 10-12

Grade Level & Cohort	N of Students/ N Assessed	Mean GPA	Percent Attaining Objective (GPA 2.0 or Better)
Grade 10			
EL	200/195	2.75	91
R-FEP	50/47	3.25	95
EH/I-FEP	350/339	3.00	95
Grade 11			
EL	150/144	2.10	90
R-FEP	100/97	2.15	92
EH/I-FEP	325/320	2.50	93
Grade 12			
EL	100/94	1.75	80
R-FEP	175/170	2.05	85
EH/I-FEP	300/294	2.25	90

R-FEP refers to EL students who have been redesignated as fluent-English proficient.
EH refers to pupils who have English as their home/primary language.
I-FEP refers to those students who have a home language other than English but who were assessed to be initially fluent-English proficient.

ANALYSIS: Generally, students in all three cohorts at all three grade levels are making adequate progress and are meeting the district criteria. There is noticeable underachievement for EL students in the twelfth grade. Teachers indicate that the underachievement may be associated with lack of previous mathematics study on the part of late entrants and a lack of reference materials in Spanish related to the topics covered in the Trigonometry and Calculus courses.

CONCLUSIONS: The program provided to underachieving students does not appear to meet all of their needs. There is a recommendation to provide identified underachieving twelfth grade EL

students with more individualized assistance by bilingual college tutors and to purchase Spanish language texts which are better aligned to the Trigonometry and Calculus courses of study.

5. Example of using portfolios to report achievement.

English Language Development - Reading and Writing Portfolio Assessment

EL students in grades 3-12 are required to develop ELD portfolios consisting of numerous writing samples such as book reports, essays, compositions, and term papers each semester. Selected portfolios entries are rated superior, adequate, limited, or not completed by teachers. Data in Table 7 are from the spring semester 1999 for intermediate and advanced ELD students.

Accountability Objective: Each semester at least 90 percent of the intermediate and advanced EL students will be able to accumulate a portfolio consisting of at least 10 writing samples rated as adequate or better for their levels of ELD.

Table 7 - ELD Portfolios
EL Students by Year of Instruction

Cohort by Year	N Students/ N Assessed	Mean N Entries	Percent Meeting Criteria (90 or above)
3 Yrs	250/245	11	80
4 Yrs	175/170	13	90
5 Yrs+	100/95	13	85

ANALYSIS: EL students by the third year of ELD instruction are approximating the district criteria and those in the fourth year have reached the standard, however, it is somewhat disconcerting to note that 15 percent of EL students with five or more years of ELD instruction have not met the district criteria. This pattern of underachievement may be related to shortcomings in the advanced ELD curriculum.

CONCLUSIONS: The ELD program does not appear to be meeting the needs of advanced ELD students. Teachers may need to analyze both the curriculum offered at this level and the particular needs of these pupils in order to target the advanced level instruction to meet the specific needs of students.

6. Example of using multiple measures to report immigrant student achievement over time.

Immigrant students are enrolled in mathematics instruction in Spanish, sheltered English, and mainstream English modes depending on their level of English proficiency. The NRT results

(SAT 9 or SABE[2]) are interfaced with GPAs as the two (multiple) measures used to determine grade level standards in math.

Accountability Objective: Immigrant students, by their fifth year of enrollment in school in the Untied States, will attain grade level performance in mathematics in the same proportion as mainstream students.

Table 8 – Immigrant Student Performance in Mathematics
Percent of Pupils Performing at Different Levels

NRT Scores (percentiles)

Grade Point Averages	NRTs/ GPAs	1-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+
	A	0	0	10	10	8	5
	B	0	0	10	10	8	3
	C	1	3	5	7	3	1
	D	3	4	2	1	0	0
	F	1	2	1	1	0	0

The figures in each box indicate the percent of pupils performing at each level (intersection of NRT scores and math GPAs). The shaded boxes indicate performance at levels that meet or surpass the grade level standards.

Analysis: As a group, 75 percent of the immigrant students are meeting grade level standards in mathematics. This is comparable to the mainstream population although the district criterion is that 90 percent of all pupils should meet grade level standards.

Conclusion: Two additional analyses are necessary in order to obtain a clearer picture of immigrant student performance. First, one analysis is needed to look at immigrant student performance based on year-in-program to determine if the pupils improve with time in the district's math program. Secondly, data will need to be disaggregated by grade level to ascertain if pupils at a particular grade level are having difficulty in attaining standards.

In addition, there may be a need to have teachers analyze their grading systems to see if the correlation between grades and NRT scores can or should be improved. There is a noticeable trend (20 percent) where immigrant students score below the 50th percentile on the NRT but are concurrently awarded a grade of A or B.

"It is impossible to produce consistently superior performance unless you do something different from the majority."
— Sir John Templeton

BEST COPY AVAILABLE